Quadratic regression for functional response models

Hidetoshi Matsui

The Center for Data Science Education and Research, Shiga University
1-1-1, Banba, Hikone, Shiga 522-8522, Japan.

hmatsui@biwako.shiga-u.ac.jp

arXiv:1702.02009v2 [stat.ME] 13 Feb 2017

Abstract: We consider the problem of constructing a regression model with a functional predictor and a functional response. We extend the functional linear model to the quadratic model, where the quadratic term also takes the interaction between the argument of the functional data into consideration. We assume that the predictor and the coefficient functions are expressed by basis expansions, and then parameters included in the model are estimated by the maximum likelihood method by assuming that the error function follows a Gaussian process. We apply the proposed method to the analysis of weather data, and then investigate what the results provides.

Key Words and Phrases: Functional data analysis; Gaussian process; Interaction

1 Introduction

Functional data analysis (FDA) has received considerable attentions in various fields of application such as bioscience and meteorology, and has experienced a number of developments on methodological, theoretical and applied studies (Ramsay and Silverman, 2002, 2005; Horváth and Kokoszka, 2012). The basic idea behind functional data analysis is to express each individual of repeatedly measured data as a smooth function and then draw information from the collection of functional data. We consider the problem of constructing a regression model where both a predictor and a response are given as functional data.

Functional regression analysis has been widely studied. When the predictor is a function while the response is a scalar, James (2002) considered the model in the framework of generalized linear models, and many other extensions such as adaptive models and neural networks have been reported (Müller and Stadtmüller, 2005; Rossi et al., 2005). Although such flexible models capture the complex relationships among variables, they sometimes cause difficult interpretation for the estimated models. On the other hand, Wei et al. (2014) constructed the functional logistic regression model that considers an interaction between genetic variants and repeatedly measured environmental exposures in order to classify a disease status of patients. The results offer insights that each variable and their interaction affects the classification of a disease. Furthermore, Yao and Müller

(2010) proposed a functional regression model with a quadratic term of the functional predictor. Suppose we have a functional predictor $X(t)$ and a scalar response Y, then the functional quadratic model is given by

$$Y = \alpha + \int X(t)\beta(t)dt + \iint X(s)X(t)\gamma(s,t)dsdt + \varepsilon,$$

where α is an intercept and $\beta(t)$ and $\gamma(s,t)$ are coefficient surfaces for the linear and quadratic terms, respectively, and ε is an additional error. Then we can take an interaction between arbitrary different two time points of $X(t)$ into consideration in the model. As similar works, Fuchs et al. (2015) and Usset et al. (2016) proposed functional regression models that consider interactions between multiple functional predictors. For the functional regression model with a functional predictor and a functional response, which is proposed by Ramsay and Dalzell (1991), several works are provided in Malfait and Ramsay (2003), Yao et al. (2005), Scheipl et al. (2015). For this type of model, neither quadratic nor interaction term is considered.

In this paper we introduce a quadratic term into the functional regression model with a functional predictor and a functional response. The predictor and coefficient functions are supposed to be expressed by basis expansions, and thus the problem of estimating coefficient functions becomes that of estimating parameter vectors. Furthermore, we consider estimating these parameters by assuming a Gaussian process to the error function, using the idea of Shi and Choi (2011), and applying the maximum likelihood method. The number of a tuning parameter appeared at the estimation process is decided by a model selection criterion derived from the results of Konishi and Kitagawa (2008). We show the effectiveness of our method by the analysis of weather data.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a functional quadratic model for a functional predictor and a functional response. In Section 3 we introduce the method for estimating and evaluating the model in the framework of the maximum likelihood method. Then we will report the result of the application of the proposed method to the analysis of real data in Section 4. Finally concluding remarks and discussions are given in Section 5.

2 Functional quadratic model

Suppose we have n sets of a functional predictor and a functional response $\{(x_i(s), y_i(t)); i = 1, \ldots, n, s \in \mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}, t \in \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}\}$, then we model the relationship between the predictor x_i and the response y_i as the following functional quadratic model

$$y_i(t) = \alpha(t) + \int_{\mathcal{S}} x_i(s)\beta(s,t)ds + \iint_{\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{S}} x_i(r)x_i(s)\gamma(r,s,t)drds + \varepsilon_i(t), \qquad (1)$$

where $\alpha(t)$ is a baseline function, $\beta(s,t)$ is a coefficient surface for the linear term, $\gamma(r,s,t)$ is a coefficient hypersurface for the quadratic term, and $\varepsilon_i(t)$ is an error term. Each coefficient function explains the weight of the predictor to the response at different time points s and t. Furthermore, the quadratic term considers an interaction of x_i at different time points.

In order to estimate the coefficient functions in functional regression models, several methods are proposed. Here we assume that the predictor is expressed by the basis expansion, that is, $x_i(s)$ has a form of

$$x_i(s) = \sum_{k=1}^{M_x} w_{ik}\phi_k(s) = \boldsymbol{w}_i^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(s),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\phi}(s) = (\phi_1(s), \ldots, \phi_{M_x}(s))^T$ is a vector of M_x basis functions and $\boldsymbol{w}_i = (w_{i1}, \ldots, w_{iM_x})^T$ is a vector of weights that are obtained using smoothing techniques (see e.g., Green and Silverman, 1994). In addition, we assume that the baseline and coefficient functions are also expressed by basis expansions as follows;

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(t) &= \sum_{l=1}^{M_y} a_l \psi_l(t) = \boldsymbol{a}^T \boldsymbol{\psi}(t), \\
\beta(s,t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{M_x}\sum_{l=1}^{M_y} b_{kl}\phi_k(s)\psi_l(t) = \boldsymbol{\phi}(s)^T B \boldsymbol{\psi}(t), \\
\gamma(r,s,t) &= \sum_{h=1}^{M_x}\sum_{k=1}^{M_x}\sum_{l=1}^{M_y} \gamma_{hkl}\phi_h(r)\phi_k(s)\psi_l(t) = \{\boldsymbol{\phi}(s)\otimes\boldsymbol{\phi}(r)\}^T \Gamma_{(3)}^T \boldsymbol{\psi}(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\psi}(t) = (\psi_1(t), \ldots, \psi_{M_y}(t))^T$ is a vector of M_y basis functions, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{M_y})^T$, $B = (b_{kl})_{kl}$ and $\Gamma_{(3)}$ is a matrix obtained by matricizing a 3-dimensional tensor $\underline{\Gamma} = (\gamma_{hkl})_{hkl}$ with respect to the 3rd array. The strict definition of $\Gamma_{(3)}$ is referred to De Lathauwer et al. (2000).

Using these assumptions, the functional quadratic model (1) is written by

$$\begin{aligned}
y_i(t) &= \boldsymbol{a}^T\boldsymbol{\psi}(t) + \boldsymbol{w}_i^T\Phi B\boldsymbol{\psi}(t) + (\boldsymbol{w}_i\otimes\boldsymbol{w}_i)^T(\Phi\otimes\Phi)\Gamma_{(3)}^T\boldsymbol{\psi}(t) + \varepsilon_i(t) \\
&= \boldsymbol{z}_i^T\Theta^T\boldsymbol{\psi}(t) + \varepsilon_i(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi = \int \boldsymbol{\phi}(s)\boldsymbol{\phi}(s)^T ds$, $\boldsymbol{z}_i = (1, w_i^T\Phi, (\boldsymbol{w}_i\otimes\boldsymbol{w}_i)^T(\Phi\otimes\Phi))^T$ and $\Theta = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}\ B^T\ \Gamma_{(3)})$ is a matrix of parameters. Thus the problem of estimating the baseline and coefficient functions is replaced by that of estimating the parameter matrix Θ.

When we have a p-th order term with respect to x_i, then using the same assumptions

described above this is expressed by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \cdots \int_{\mathcal{S}^p} x_i(s_1) \cdots x_i(s_p) \gamma(s_1, \ldots, s_p, t) ds_1 \cdots ds_p \\
&= \int \cdots \int_{\mathcal{S}^p} (\boldsymbol{w}_i \otimes \cdots \otimes \boldsymbol{w}_i)^T (\boldsymbol{\phi}(s_p) \otimes \cdots \otimes \boldsymbol{\phi}(s_1)) \\
&\qquad \times (\boldsymbol{\phi}(s_p) \otimes \cdots \otimes \boldsymbol{\phi}(s_1))^T \Gamma_{(p)}^T \boldsymbol{\psi}(t) ds_1 \cdots ds_p \\
&= (\boldsymbol{w}_i \otimes \cdots \otimes \boldsymbol{w}_i)^T (\Phi \otimes \cdots \otimes \Phi) \Gamma_{(p)}^T \boldsymbol{\psi}(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_{(p)}$ is a matrix obtained by matricizing a p-dimensional tensor $\underline{\Gamma} = (\gamma_{k_1,\ldots,k_p})_{k_1,\ldots,k_p}$ with respect to the p-th array. Therefore we can easily extend the quadratic model to the polynomial model and estimate it in the similar way by the method described in the next section.

3 Estimation and evaluation of the model

We consider estimating the model in the framework of the maximum likelihood method. In order to do it, we assume that the error function $\varepsilon_i(t)$ has the following structure (Fan and Zhang, 2000):

$$\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon_i(t) = \tau_i(t) + e_i(t), \\
\tau_i(t) \sim GP(0, k(\cdot, \cdot)), \quad e_i(t) \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2), \quad k(t, t') = \nu_1 \exp\left\{ -\frac{\nu_2}{2}(t - t')^2 \right\},
\end{gathered}$$

where $GP(0, k(\cdot, \cdot))$ denotes a Gaussian process with mean 0 and a covariance function k, and $\nu_1 > 0$, $\nu_2 > 0$, and σ^2 are additional parameters of the model. By considering the response $\boldsymbol{y}_i = (y_{i1}, \ldots, y_{in_i})^T$ observed at n_i time points $t_{i1}, \ldots, t_{in_i}$ for each subject, we have a following probability density function:

$$f(\boldsymbol{y}_i | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\nu}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n_i/2} \sqrt{|\Sigma_i|}} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{y}_i - \Psi_i \Theta \boldsymbol{z}_i)^T \Sigma_i^{-1} (\boldsymbol{y}_i - \Psi_i \Theta \boldsymbol{z}_i) \right\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \sigma^2)^T$, $\Sigma_i = K_i + \sigma^2 I_{n_i}$, $K_i = (k(t_{ij}, t_{ij'}))_{jj'}$ and $\Psi_i = (\boldsymbol{\psi}(t_{i1}), \ldots, \boldsymbol{\psi}(t_{in_i}))^T$.

By maximizing the log-likelihood function $\ell(\Theta, \boldsymbol{\nu}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log f(\boldsymbol{y}_i | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, we obtain maximum likelihood estimators $\hat{\Theta}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$. If $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ were known, the Θ would be estimated as

$$\mathrm{vec}\hat{\Theta} = \left\{ \sum_i (\boldsymbol{z}_i^T \otimes \Psi_i)^T \Sigma_i^{-1} (\boldsymbol{z}_i^T \otimes \Psi_i) \right\}^{-1} \left\{ \sum_i (\boldsymbol{z}_i^T \otimes \Psi_i)^T \Sigma_i^{-1} \boldsymbol{y}_i \right\}.$$

In practice $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is unknown and furthermore it is difficult to derive the estimator of it analytically. Therefore several iterative algorithms are used, here we apply the Newton-Raphson method. It is updated in the following way:

$$\boldsymbol{\nu}^{new} = \boldsymbol{\nu}^{old} - \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\Theta, \boldsymbol{\nu})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\nu} \partial \boldsymbol{\nu}^T} \right\}^{-1} \frac{\partial \ell(\Theta, \boldsymbol{\nu})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\nu}},$$

where the first and the second derivatives of $\ell(\Theta, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ are respectively given by

$$\frac{\partial \ell(\Theta, \boldsymbol{\nu})}{\partial \nu_j} = \sum_i \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{tr} \left\{ \left(\boldsymbol{r}_i \boldsymbol{r}_i^T - \Sigma_i^{-1} \right) \frac{\partial \Sigma_i}{\partial \nu_j} \right\} \right],$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ell(\Theta, \boldsymbol{\nu})}{\partial \nu_j \partial \nu_{j'}} = \sum_i \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{tr} \left\{ \left(\boldsymbol{r}_i \boldsymbol{r}_i^T - \Sigma_i^{-1} \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 \Sigma_i}{\partial \nu_j \partial \nu_{j'}} - S_i^{(jj')} \right) - \boldsymbol{r}_i \boldsymbol{r}_i^T S_i^{(jj')} \right\} \right],$$

$$\boldsymbol{r}_i = \Sigma_i^{-1} (\boldsymbol{y}_i - \Psi_i \Theta \boldsymbol{z}_i)^T, \quad S_i^{(jj')} = \frac{\partial \Sigma_i}{\partial \nu_j} \Sigma_i^{-1} \frac{\partial \Sigma_i}{\partial \nu_j}.$$

Parameters Θ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ are alternately updated until convergence, and then we have maximum likelihood estimators $\hat{\Theta}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$, respectively.

It is important to select an appropriate value of the number of basis functions M_y and therefore we need to decide an optimal number of it. We apply an AIC-type model selection criterion. By applying the result of Akaike (1974) to our model, we have a model selection criterion given by

$$\mathrm{AIC} = -2\ell(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}) + 2p, \tag{2}$$

where the number of parameters here is given by $p = (1 + M_x + M_x^2)M_y + 3$. We select the value of M_y that minimizes the AIC and then treat the corresponding model as an optimal one.

4 Real data example

We applied the proposed method to the analysis of weather data available from Chronological Scientific Tables 2005. We used monthly temperatures and monthly total (log) precipitations avaraged from 1971 to 2000, observed at 76 cities in Japan. The data are shown in Figure 1. We treated the temperature and the precipitation as a predictor and a response, respectively. The aim of this analysis is to model the relationship between temperatures and precipitations observed at 12 time points and then investigate the estimated response and coefficients. Here we assume that the data have annual periodicities, that is, we allow for the fact that the temperature of a month affects the precipitation of the other earlier month of the next year.

First we smoothed the data for the temperature using the radial basis functions proposed by Kawano and Konishi (2007) and then obtained weights $\boldsymbol{w}_i$. Next we estimated parameters Θ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ by the maximum likelihood method. The number of basis functions M_y is then selected by model selection criterion AIC given in (2). Then we investigated the estimated precipitation and coefficient functions for the linear and quadratic terms.



Figure 1: Weather data observed at cities in Japan. Dots are observed data and each individual is connected by lines. Left: monthly average temperature. Right: monthly total precipitation.

Figure 2 shows estimated precipitations for models with and without the quadratic term. Both results roughly capture the trend of the precipitation, but the result with the quadratic term estimate the individual variation of the response better than that without the quadratic term. Furthermore, we showed the estimated baseline and coefficient functions for the linear and the quadratic term when we used the model with the quadratic term in Figure 3. The baseline function $\hat{\alpha}(t)$ roughly captures the overall trend of precipitation functions. The coefficient surface for the linear term indicates the contribution of the temperature $X(s)$ to the precipitation $Y(t)$ at arbitrary times s and t. The result shows that the temperature in winter contributes to the precipitation at the beginning of the year.

Figure 4 shows the estimated hypersurface $\hat{\gamma}(r, s, t)$ visualized at discrete time points of the precipitation functions. This function indicates the interaction of the predictor between at r and s at arbitrary time points t. From these surfaces we find that the coefficient have larger values at the beggining and the end of t. This result shows that the temperature affects the precipitation of winter rather than summer. Furthermore, the quadratic (diagonal) part of the function indicates that when the temperature in winter is low, the precipitation (in this case the snowfall) increases. On the other hand, the interaction part shows that when the temperatures at winter and spring are high the precipitation also increases.

5 Concluding remarks

Functional regression models elucidate the complex relationship between variables that are repeatedly measured. In this paper we constructed the quadratic models for functional



Figure 2: Estimated response functions for the model without the quadratic term (Left) and with one (Right).



Figure 3: Estimated intercept function $\alpha(t)$ (Left) and coefficient surface for the linear term $\beta(s,t)$ (Right).

data where both the predictor and the response are given as functions. In addition to providing more flexible models than the linear model, it offers another insight that it considers the interaction of the predictor at different time points. We estimated the model by assuming the Gaussian process for the error function, and then parameters included in the model are estimated by the maximum likelihood method. The tuning parameter appeared at the estimation procedure is selected by the model selection criterion. The effectiveness of our method is evaluated through real data analysis.

In this paper we treated the data set as functions of time and assumed that they have annual periodicities. However, in general it gives us the paradoxical insight that the future information of the predictor affects the response at the past time when the data are functions of time. As an approach for such problem, Malfait and Ramsay (2003) proposed a historical functional linear model that takes an information of predictor only at the past time of the response. One future work is to apply the idea of the historical functional linear model to our model and to apply the analysis of data without periodicity.

For functional linear models with functional response, several estimation method are proposed rather than that we used in this paper. We want to compare the accuracy and the computational speed of our method to other methods. We also consider applying the penalized likelihood method by extending the maximum likelihood method in order to obtain more stable estimates.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) No. 16K16020 of JSPS.

References

Akaike, H. (1974), "A new look at the statistical model identification," *IEEE Trans. Auto. Control*, 19, 716–723.

De Lathauwer, L., De Moor, B., and Vandewalle, J. (2000), "A multilinear singular value decomposition," *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 21, 1253–1278.

Fan, J. and Zhang, J. (2000), "Two-step estimation of functional linear models with applications to longitudinal data," *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 62, 303–322.

Fuchs, K., Scheipl, F., and Greven, S. (2015), "Penalized scalar-on-functions regression with interaction term," *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.*, 81, 38–51.

Green, P. and Silverman, B. (1994), *Nonparametric regression and generalized linear models: a roughness penalty approach*, London: Chapman & Hall/CRC.

Horváth, L. and Kokoszka, P. (2012), *Inference for functional data with applications*, New York: Springer.

James, G. (2002), "Generalized linear models with functional predictors," *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 64, 411–432.

Kawano, S. and Konishi, S. (2007), "Nonlinear regression modeling via regularized Gaussian basis functions," *Bull. Inform. Cybern.*, 39, 83–96.

Konishi, S. and Kitagawa, G. (2008), *Information criteria and statistical modeling*, New York: Springer.

Malfait, N. and Ramsay, J. (2003), "The historical functional linear model," *Canad. J. Statist.*, 31, 115–128.

Müller, H. and Stadtmüller, U. (2005), "Generalized functional linear models," *Ann. Statist.*, 33, 774–805.

Ramsay, J. and Dalzell, C. (1991), "Some tools for functional data analysis," *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 53, 539–572.

Ramsay, J. and Silverman, B. (2002), *Applied functional data analysis: methods and case studies*, New York: Springer.

— (2005), *Functional data analysis 2nd ed.*, New York: Springer.

Rossi, F., Delannay, N., Conan-Guez, B., and Verleysen, M. (2005), "Representation of functional data in neural networks," *Neurocomputing*, 64, 183–210.

Scheipl, F., Staicu, A.-M., and Greven, S. (2015), "Functional Additive Mixed Models," *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, 24, 477–501.

Shi, J. Q. and Choi, T. (2011), *Gaussian Process Regression Analysis for Functional Data*, Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Usset, J., Staicu, A. M., and Maity, A. (2016), "Interaction models for functional regression," *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, 94, 317–330.

Wei, P., Tang, H., and Li, D. (2014), "Functional logistic regression approach to detecting gene by longitudinal environmental exposure interaction in a case-control study." *Genet. Epidemiol.*, 38, 638–51.

Yao, F., Müller, H., and Wang, J. (2005), "Functional linear regression analysis for longitudinal data," *Ann. Statist.*, 33, 2873–2903.

Yao, F. and Müller, H.-G. (2010), "Functional quadratic regression," *Biometrika*, 97, 49–64.



Figure 4: Estimated coefficient hypersurface for the quadratic term $\gamma(r, s, t)$ with $t = 1, \ldots, 12$ (From top left to bottom right). The middle of the vertical axis is zero for all figures.